

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

TAMINA CHRISTINE SHOCK,
Plaintiff,
vs.
LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN
POLICE DEPARTMENT, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 2:14-cv-01261-RFB-CWH

ORDER

LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN
POLICE DEPARTMENT, et al.,
Defendants.

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion to Strike (#25), filed February 3, 2015, and Defendants' Motion to Strike (#27), filed February 13, 2015.

1. Motion to Strike (#27)

Defendants request that the Court strike Plaintiff's Response (#24) because it exceeds the prescribed page limitations for a responsive brief. The undersigned agrees that the response exceeds the applicable page limitations set forth in LR 7-4, but declines to strike the filing.

2. Motion to Strike (#25)

It appears that Plaintiff requests that the Court strike Defendants recently filed motion to compel. Plaintiff cites Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(f) in support of the request. Rule 12(f) provides authority to strike matters from pleadings. Rule 7(a) identifies pleadings as the complaint, answer, and reply, but not motions and other papers. There is no provision in the Federal Rules for motions to strike another motion or memoranda. *See Pimentel & Sons Guitar Makers, Inc. v. Pimentel*, 229 F.R.D. 201, 203 (D.N.M. 2005) (citation omitted). A motion to strike matters not part of the pleadings may, however, be regarded as an invitation by the movant to consider whether proffered material may be properly relied upon. *United States v. Crisp*, 190 F.R.D. 546, 550-51 (E.D. Cal. 1999). After review, the Court denies the request to strike the motion to compel as it is improper under Rule 12(f), and there are no valid reasons proffered why it should not be considered.

1 Based on the foregoing and good cause appearing,

2 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motion to Strike (#25) is **denied**.

3 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Defendants' Motion to Strike (#27) is **denied**.

4 DATED: February 18, 2015.

5
6 
7

C.W. Hoffman, Jr.
8 United States Magistrate Judge